



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/813,019	03/31/2004	Huan Hsiang Hsu	BHT-3244-43	3881

7590 10/18/2005  
TROXELL LAW OFFICE PLLC  
SUITE 1404  
5205 LEESBURG PIKE  
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22041

EXAMINER
----------

RIELLEY, ELIZABETH A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2879

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



## DETAILED ACTION

### *Specification*

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the term "lamp" for 21 is confusing since 20 is already a cold cathode lamp. Is 21 an open portion of the CCFL or an additional lamp?

Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Objections*

Claims 1-3 are objected to because of the following informalities: the phrase "a CCFL disposed in the tube and having a lamp exposed by two ends therefor" is confusing, since a CCFL is a lamp. Does the applicant mean the cold cathode lamp is exposed or is there an additional lamp? Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsh (US 6135620) in view of Goldburt et al (US 5585694).

In regard to claim 1, Marsh teaches a CCFL tube device comprising: a tube made of transparent materials (262; column 12 line 23 to column 13 line 14); a CCFL disposed in the tube (260) and having a lamp exposed by two ends thereof (286); a cap covering each end of the tube (294; figure 17); and terminals symmetrically arranged in the cap for electrically connecting the lamp (290). Marsh is silent

Art Unit: 2879

regarding the limitation that there are two terminals on each cap. Goldburt et al ('694) teach two terminals (9) on each cap (8; figure 1; abstract; column 4 line 24-56) in order to improve the lamp contact. Hence, it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the CCFL tube as taught by March with the double terminals of Goldburt. Motivation to combine would be to improve the lamp contact.

In regard to claim 2, the Examiner notes that the Applicant's recitation of the cap glued to the tube is considered a product by process recitation. The patentability of the claim resides on the final product and not the process by which it was manufactured. Accordingly, Marsh's teaching of the cap joined to the tub is considered to meet the claimed recitation.

In regard to claim 3, March teaches the terminals (290) penetrate through and secure to the cap (294; see figure 17), each terminal is a hollow pipe (see figure 17, 290 and 286 run through it) and the lamp (290, 286) is exposed by the CCFL (286?) to accommodate each of the terminals (294). In regard to Applicant's recitation that each terminal is soldered to the lamp following cutting tips of the terminals for electrical connection between the lamp and each of the terminals, the Examiner notes that the recitation is considered to be a product by process recitation. The patentability of the claim resides on the final product and not the process by which it was manufactured. Accordingly, Marsh's teaching of the terminal joined to the lamp and cap is considered to meet the claimed recitation.


### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Chou (US 20050077827) teaches caps covering each end of a CCFL. .

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elizabeth A. Rielley whose telephone number is 571-272-2117. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimeshkumar Patel can be reached on 571-272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
*Elizabeth Rielley*

**Examiner**  
**Art Unit 2879**

  
**MARICELI SANTIAGO**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**